

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-1037

TOWN OF YEMASSEE MUNICIPAL COURT,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

NANCY D. JONAS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort. Joseph E. Anderson, Jr., Chief District Judge; Sol Blatt, Jr., Senior District Judge. (CA-03-1508-9-08AJ)

Submitted: March 11, 2004

Decided: March 18, 2004

Before WIDENER, WILKINSON, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nancy D. Jonas, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Nancy D. Jonas seeks to appeal the district court's order affirming the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and dismissing her civil action for lack of jurisdiction. We dismiss the appeal in part for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed as to this order.

Parties are accorded thirty days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order to note an appeal, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A), unless the district court extends the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5) or reopens the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). This appeal period is "mandatory and jurisdictional." Browder v. Dir., Dep't of Corr., 434 U.S. 257, 264 (1978) (quoting United States v. Robinson, 361 U.S. 220, 229 (1960)).

The district court's order that Jonas seeks to appeal was entered on the docket on October 30, 2003. The notice of appeal was filed on January 2, 2004. Because Jonas failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal to the extent that it pertains to this order.

The notice of appeal is timely, however, as to the district court's orders denying Jonas's motions for rehearing en banc and her motion for leave to file a motion for a new trial. To the extent that Jonas is appealing these orders, we note that she

was warned in the briefing order that this court would not consider issues not specifically raised in her informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Nonetheless, Jonas failed to raise any challenges to the district court's orders denying her post-judgment motions in her informal brief and thus has failed to preserve any issues for our review. Accordingly, we affirm these orders for the reasons stated by the district court. See Yemassee Mun. Ct. v. Jonas, No. CA-03-1508-9-08AJ (D.S.C. filed Dec. 9, 2003 & entered Dec. 10, 2003; Jan. 2, 2004; Jan. 21, 2004). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED IN PART,
AND DISMISSED IN PART